

REMARKS

At the time of the Office Action dated October 26, 2004, claims 1-56 were pending and rejected in this application. Claims 3-4, 9-12, 14, 31-32, 37-40, and 42 have been amended. Applicants submit that the present Amendment does not generate any new matter issue.

CLAIM 12 IS REJECTED UNDER THE SECOND PARAGRAPH OF 35 U.S.C. § 112

On page two of the Office Action, the Examiner identified a perceived informality generating an antecedent basis issue. Applicants have amended claim 12 to address this issue. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit the withdrawal of the imposed rejection to claim 12 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

**CLAIMS 1-56 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY
LOPRESTI ET AL., U.S. PATENT NO. 5,754,308 (HEREINAFTER LOPRESTI)**

In the statement of the rejection, the Examiner asserted that Lopresti discloses an apparatus and system corresponding to that claimed. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that there are significant differences between Lopresti and the invention defined in the claims that would preclude a factual determination that Lopresti identically describes the claimed invention within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 1 and 29:

Lopresti does not teach or suggest that an inputted documentary image is outputted with an ID mark by the output means while the image is stored in a storing means by the document management means. Furthermore, Lopresti does not teach or suggest that the documentary image received by the facsimile receiving means is stored while being attached with the document ID.

Claims 2 and 30:

Lopresti does not teach or suggest that, while the inputted documentary image is being stored in the storing means, the image is outputted with the document ID mark. In addition, Lopresti does not teach or suggest "wherein said documentary image includes only the attribute information of said specific document."

Claims 9 and 10:

Lopresti relates to the printing and archiving. In contrast, the copying and archiving of a specific document recited in claim 9 is carried out by performing the storing of the documentary image and the printing of the documentary image with the ID mark simultaneously under the configuration that an output from the image reading means is directly inputted to the pattern synthesizing means, and then is outputted by the output means. Thus, Lopresti fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Additionally, as recited in claim 10, at the time of the copying and archiving for copying plural sets, a first set of copy is completed by directly inputting an output from the image reading

means to the pattern synthesizing means and then printing it by the output means, and a second set of copy is completed by printing the documentary image stored in the storage means.

Lopresti, however, does not teach or suggest comparable copying and archiving for a plurality of copies.

Claims 11-13 and 39-41:

Lopresti describes that the layout information of the document is encoded and then embedded in an ID mark. In contrast, as recited in the claims of the present application, for the pattern synthesizing means to determine a position to be attached with an ID mark, the document ID encoding means outputs the form size and the layout position information to the pattern synthesizing means. Lopresti, however, fails to make such a disclosure.

Claims 14 and 42:

Lopresti does not teach or suggest a dialog type operating means for selecting whether or not to add an ID mark on an output, as recited in claims 14 and 42.

Claims 15 and 43:

Lopresti does not teach or suggest a selecting step of designating a document either based on the decoding of ID mark or based on the direct input of document ID, as recited in claims 15 and 43.

Claims 20 and 48:

Lopresti does not teach or suggest a method of selecting a target document from a plurality of documents suggested to a user by displaying attribute of other documents in connection with the document ID, as recited in claims 20 and 48.

Claims 25 and 53:

Lopresti does not teach or suggest that an ID mark contained in the documentary image received by the facsimile receiving means is decoded and then the stored documentary image corresponding to the ID is sent to the sending end, as recited in claims 24 and 53.

The above argued differences between the claimed invention and the system of Lopresti undermine the factual determination that Lopresti identically describes the claimed invention within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that the imposed rejection of claims 1-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 for anticipation based upon Lopresti is not factually viable and, hence, solicit withdrawal thereof.

Applicants have made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. However, Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. Accordingly, and in view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Application No.: 09/768,213

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Scott D. Paul', written in a cursive style.

Scott D. Paul
Registration No. 42,984

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 SDP:kap
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: January 26, 2005

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**